MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 September 1967
INDEX

		Page
1.	D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic	
	Three Sisters Bridge - Revised Design	1
	Inner Loop Freeway, South Leg	1-2
2.	D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds	
	Police Training Facilities, Blue Plains, Va.	2
3.	Department of Interior, National Park Service	
	Lincoln Park, Relandscaping, New Walks, Bethune Memorial	2
4.	D.C. Government, Board of Zoning Adjustments	
	Watergate Development - Height of Building 1 next to John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	3
5.	Federal Reserve Board	
	Federal Reserve Board Building - Revised Design	3-4
6.	D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections	
	O.G. 68-42, Georgetown University Heating and Cooling Plant	4
7.	Freer Gallery of Art	
	Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions	4

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The second session of the regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in the office of the Interior Building on 20 September 1967, at 9:30 a.m. with Chairman William Walton presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
Chloethiel W. Smith
John Walker

Staff: C.H.Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Research Analyst
Myra Younker, Editor
NCPC: Donald Jackson
Recorder: Thomas Stout

II. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Thomas Airis and G.I. Sawyer represented the Department of Highways and Traffic.

a. Three Sisters Bridge - Revised Design

The Chairman stated the Commission's approval of the design, briefly noting the reasons for the Commission's action. He extended the Commission's congratulations to officials of the Highway Department and the engineers.

As a postscript, however, the Chairman expressed the hope that some way can be found to develop a railing which would permit a view of the river. It is particularly scenic at this location, one of the finest natural landscapes in the Washington area, and the motorist should be able to see it. The Highway Department agreed to study the matter carefully.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the Department of Highways and Traffic. EXHIBIT A

b. Inner Loop Freeway, South Leg - Revised Design

Mr. Reese, engineer consultant, attended the meeting.

The Chairman expressed the Commission's approval of the simplified

design for the ventilating structures and the relocated site north of Constitution Avenue for the west shaft. But he stated flatly the Commission would not approve any plan which altered the character of the Reflecting Pool setting in any way, temporarily or permanently. This monumental vista with its trees extending from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial must be preserved. He stated that the Freeway must be relocated, and as one possibility suggested it be routed under the Munitions and Main Navy Buildings, thus clearing the Park from an encroachment dating from World War I, while at the same time preserving the Reflecting Pool.

Officials of the Highway Department and the engineer were sympathetic to the Commissions views and will study its recommendation.

The Commission's disapproval and suggestion were forwarded to the Department of Highways and Traffic. EXHIBIT B

2. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Police Training Facilities, Blue Plains Va. - Proposed Design

Gerald A. Purcell, Department of Buildings and Grounds, and Stanley McGaughan, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Sasaki expressed the Commission's approval of the site and design of this building. He suggested that the parking areas be depressed, if possible, and more planting be included as a screen.

Mr. McGaughan agreed to the Commission's recommendation.

The Commission's approval and suggestion were forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT C

3. Department of Interior, National Park Service

Lincoln Park, Relandscaping, new walks, Bethune Memorial

Walter Roth, National Park Service representative, attended the meeting.

Mr. Sasaki expressed the Commission's approval of the plan which incorporated the Commission's previous recommendations to remove several diagonal walks and to make the planting scheme less formal.

Plans for the setting of the Bethune Memorial will be submitted later.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Department of the Interior, National Park Service. EXHIBIT D

4. D.C. Government, Board of Zoning Adjustments

Watergate Development - Height of Building 1 next to John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

William Graff and William Lichtenberg, counsel, represented the Watergate Development, and Morris Ketchum, Edward Stone, architect, and Ralph Becker, counsel, the Kennedy Center. Mr. Green of the D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections also attended.

Presentations by representatives of both groups and their discussion of this problem with the Commission are EXHIBIT E.

The prepared statements of Becker and Lichtenberg, and that of Roger Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Center which was submitted by Becker have been made a part of the Commission's permanent files.

The Commission stated that it was regrettable that the problem had not been recognized in the initial phases of both project, then continued their discussion in executive session. EXHIBIT F

Two resolutions were proposed:

Mr. Walker recommended that without prejudice one way or the other regarding the construction or design of the building the Commission put off its decision until the Planning Commission decided on a course of action. The members voted 3 to 2 against this resolution.

Mr. Bunshaft recommended that the Commission approve the design submitted which conforms to the cornice line and with the penthouses as previously approved. Exterior details must be submitted for review. This approval was solely on the basis of design within the property ownership of this project and should not be interpreted as interfering with any efforts to acquire this land for the Kennedy Center. The members voted 4 to 1 for this resolution, with Mr. Walker opposed. The Chairman abstained.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Board of Zoning Adjustment EXHIBIT G. The Commission press release is EXHIBIT H and Mr. Walker's dissenting opinion, EXHIBIT I.

5. Federal Reserve Board

Federal Reserve Board Building - Revised Design

Governor Shepardson, Federal Reserve Board, and Mr. Larson, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Bunshaft, speaking for the members stated that scheme two with the thin fascia and relatively small mechanical penthouse was more suitable to the design of the building and was approved. Scheme one was

heavy and ungainly and should not even be considered. The representatives of the Board appeared to accept the Commission's action, although they regretted what they alleged would be an increase in cost. The Commission had earlier in executive discussions rejected this argument.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Federal Reserve Board.
EXHIBIT J

6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

O.G. 68-42, Georgetown University Heating and Cooling Plant

Neill Phillips, Grosvenor Chapman and James Deane representing the Committee of 100 on the Federal City and Julian P. Green of the Department of Licenses and Inspections attended the meeting.

Mr. Deane gave a detailed presentation of his study for the site of the Plant and the recommendation that it be more centrally located on the campus.

The Commission took the matter under advisement and in executive session decided the questions raised by this study concerned zoning and planning. Since these were resolved when the site was approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts again reviewed the design and voted unanimously to approve it.

The Commission's approval of the design was reported to the D.C. Department of Licenses and Inspections.

7. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions

The Commission agreed that local members should go to the Freer Gallery of Art, at a convenient date, to review acquisitions proposed for purchase.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

20 September 1967

Dear Tom:

It was a pleasure to be able to tell you at our September 20th meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts that we approved unanimously the newest design for a Potomac bridge near Three Sisters.

As you could gather from the comments made by various members, we felt that your designer had performed brilliantly in creating a design for one of the most important scenic sites around the Capital. Its simplicity and its daring both are very commendable characteristics. I am sure you will remember our exhortations to make the railings equally attractive and not to interfere with the motorists' enjoyment of the great view when they are crossing the bridge. And one last word -- almost a warning -- remember that the hardware of lighting engineers can either ruin or enhance your beautiful structure. Be careful!

With best wishes,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director
D.C. Department of Highways and Traffic
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit A

3 October 1967

Dear Mr. Airis:

This will confirm the Commission's action on the South Leg Tunnel of the Inner Loop which we discussed with you at our meeting on September 20th.

We cannot accept the present alignment of the tunnel until there is a guarantee that the water bordering the Reflecting Pool will be unharmed by the excavation. Studies presented to the Commission indicate the damage would be grave. The only workable solution is to realign the highway to bypass the Reflecting Pool, either at the west end or a route to the north of the Reflecting Pool in the vicinity of the Munitions Building.

The Commission wants to make absolutely clear why it is taking this action. Much more is involved than tree conservation. These trees are an integral part of an architectural design which is one of the most renowned places in America. The proposed tree removal would require at least a generation to restore the quiet scene and it is by this standard that the cost of realignment of the highway must be judged.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director
Department of Highways and Traffic
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit B

4 October 1967

Dear General Mathe:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on Sept[illegible] 20th, approved the preliminary designs for the Police Tr[illegible] Facilities at Blue Plains.

While there were no major objections to the design we feel the plans could bear some additional study with the hope that some of the details can be simplified.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General Robert E. Mathe
Engineer Commissioner, District
of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit C

3 October 1967

Dear Mr. Jett:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on September 20th approved the revised designs for relandscaping of Lincoln Park, S. E.

We would, of course, expect to see Carrara of the Bethune Memorial setting prior to any final contract.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. T. Sutton Jett
Regional Director
National Capital Region, Natl Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit D

MR. WALKER: Would you rather not have me ask it?

MR. SASAKI: I think it is a good question to ask, and see what they say.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am particularly anxious that our discussion be in the executive session, so that the members will not be quarreling in public.

MR. ATHERTON: The Watergate people are here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Alright, let them come in and make their request.

(Whereupon, the delegation from the Watergate Development entered the room.)

MR. GRAF: I don't think we have to introduce ourselves. I am William Graf, architect. I have been with the project for a few years. The primary reason for our being here today, I think, is clear. We had to submit to the Board of Zoning Adjustment the project as it was originally approved in 1962 for further processing, and approval, of our building number one, stage four. As you may have seen from a booklet, and from the various drawings, the building was approved with a step down here.

Since then, in various meetings with the Fine Arts Commission we have presented both drawings and the model.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have seen it all.

MR. GRAF: And the Commission has recommended

that the excessive high points be cut down, and the whole project be presented and built to the uniform cornice height.

I believe it was in November 1964, November 19th, in this room when stage one was approved, and at that time the whole project was cut down from its previous height to the uniform cornice line. That is the reason for this presentation. We have submitted drawings, alternate drawings, showing both. Legally, we were forced to do this because of the mechanics of the Board of Zoning Adjustment hearing. We have submitted it the way it was approved originally,and also the alternate, and now I believe the issue is for your Commission to give an opinion as to which one of the two versions should be built. Our developers, naturally, will be glad to go along with the Fine Arts Commission's recommendation.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What are the two? I don't understand what are the two alternates.

MR. GRAF: We have presented the drawings, and I believe it was shown both here and on this elevation. This is shown as a step down version. This is the other one, the 140 foot cornice line that was agreed to at one time, a uniform height of 140, and this would correspond to the previous three stages which are all built at the same height.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The model that we have doesn't

conform to this drawing.

MR. GRAF: It does conform.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The model shows this building higher than the others. This drawing here, you know, the white stuff. This is exactly the same as the other building you are building?

MR. GRAF: Exactly the same, Mr. Bunshaft. It was sitting right next to you at the time.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I was confused by the model, I thought you were trying to get something higher.

MR. SALGO: The present existing three buildings completely conform to your recommendations, and aesthetically this indicates that the single line is the only line to build.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you would say that now.

MR. GRAF: Well, this is the essence of it and I know that the Commission is very busy. I don't want to say anything that is superfluous. Do you have any questions?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Doesn't this seem to have another penthouse there?

MR. GRAF: This is the 140 foot cornice line.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This drawing, here, conforms to this model.

MR. GRAF: Exactly.

MR. SASAKI: In order to understand the other

drawing, can we see the alternative?

MR. GRAF: This is the same building from the other side.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The first drawing that you just folded over.

MR. SASAKI: This is 140 here; isn't it? The penthouse is about 140, this one here 140, so you can say it is stepping down but you can also say it is stepping up.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That concept was approved once. This submission that we had previously approved in general, I am not sure in general, but--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The building that is up for approval is this one here. Let's stick to the one that is up for approval.

MR. SALGO: It is a legality, and we had no intention to present it but--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now, we are back on the track. We want to look at the building that is up for approval.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What we are looking at now is the uniform thing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The rest is for our memoirs.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That Lincoln drawing there; does that building in silhouette conform to those drawings here?

MR. SALGO: It depends on where you look at it, sir.

MR. GRAF: The 140 foot cornice does correspond.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are trying to get a presentation here that shows the same thing.

MR. GRAF: Yes, sir; the height of the 140 foot cornice line is this one, and the added penthouse is here, which corresponds to this elevation here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That is all I ask. We are not selling, or under selling. We just want to have a set of drawings here that are uniform. Now, you can start.

MR. GRAF: I have stated what we have in mind.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are looking. Do you have any questions? This isn't the first presentation. We have been seeing this for four years, so that we won't be asking any questions that we have asked in previous years.

MR. WALKER: Let me ask at least one question here, because I have been reading the history of this as best as I have been able to in this report, and it says:

> "The plan for this project required the closing of parts of 26th and 27th streets, and G and H streets, Northwest, where public spaces in the form of street closing was made available to developers to encourage freedom in planning.
>
> "The Members of the Commission of Fine Arts believed that the developer, in

turn, was obligated to provide some other amenities to the public such as additional parking space."

Now, my question is is this open to the public?

MR. GRAF: It is, sir, up to the swimming pool edges, of course, because swimming pools have to be enclosed by law; but it is open.

MR. WALKER: It is this strip that is open, that is your additional parking space.

MR. GRAF: That is right.

MR. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Any other questions from the Commission? Mrs. Smith?

MR. SMITH: I am too new.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: New questions are sometimes the most revealing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How many apartments are in this last building, roughly? 200; 300?

MR. GRAF: 400 apartments, 450.

MR. BUNSHAFT: How many are in the rest of the project already built?

MR. GRAF: We have the hotel with 225 rooms, and this is an office building, so we have--

MR. BUNSHAFT: 400 apartments existing, and this new building will equal that?

MR. GRAF: Yes, sir.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am just trying to get a rough sense of proportion. A 225 room hotel?

MR. GRAF: Yes, sir.

MR. WALKER: This treatment of the top of these buildings hasn't been finished yet, I take it. I have driven past it, and it doesn't look at all like this.

MR. GRAF: This is a schematic model, and it is very hard to finish. The penthouses are there, and this will be pulled together--as we said--with a uniform roof to give it a more quiet appearance.

MR. WALKER: That has not been done yet?

MR. GRAF: The first two buildings have been done.

MR. WALKER: Maybe that is decoration, but it looks very different to me.

MR. GRAF: It looks very much like this, if you look at it from the proper perspective.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You have to get down on your knees.

MR. WALKER: I go past this every day, and I see the walls and the development of gardens up there, and so forth. I see these sticking up, and I don't see any of that green stuff.

MR. SALGO: Because of the perspective, it is really impossible to see them.

MR. WALKER: The thing that interests me is the

MR. DRAKE: Very nice.

MS. ROSEBERRY: I do just feeling so good a proud sense of production. I can move mountains.

MR. DRAKE: Yeah, sir.

MR. WALKER: Life freedom. I see the joy of reading quotations means I have to. I don't like past it, and it doesn't look me at all like that.

MR. DRAKE: This is a economic model, and it is very many ways to think. One particular I was there and some will be putting somebody--as we anticipate a delicious year so give it a more quiet atmosphere.

MR. WALKER: That was surprising some year.

MR. DRAKE: The first two buildings have been done.

MS. WALKER: Maybe that is inconvenient for looks very different to me.

MR. DRAKE: It looks very much like plan. It look at it true the proper perspective.

MS. ROSEBERRY: You have to get there to [illegible].

MR. WALKER. I do pass also here, say pay I see the walls and the development of pleasant as there, and on roads. I see comes attention to, you I think we say it like green also?

MR. DRAKE: Because of the physicality, it's really impossible to see them.

MR. WALKER: The going that relevant we to see

treatment of this roof, and at the present moment if that is the finished treatment, the visual effect on the passer-by is not the same as this.

MR. GRAF: The individual tenants who are purchasing these apartments are gradually moving in, or have moved in, and the landscape is not complete. It is our intention to have a uniform landscaping.

MRS. SMITH: Would you show me what projections above this roof are necessary; would it be possible to eliminate, as you approach the Kennedy Center, some of the additional roof structures which are now envisioned?

MR. GRAF: We'd be happy to eliminate the penthouses but, as you know, the code requires an overrun of 20 feet.

MRS. SMITH: What else along here; could this all be simplified as it contrasts with the Center?

MR. GRAF: The small staircases that come up from each apartment with its own garden, that is all this structure here. There is a six foot six high wall which separates one garden from another, which might conceivably be taken off, or the stairs be made out of glass, but they are out of glass already on this building. So, we are trying to give as little importance to the superstructure as possible. This is why Mr. Morrietti made the sculptural shapes on the roof, and some people don't like it but--

MR. SMITH: I was trying to find out if these

things that are adjacent to the final design of the Center, if a portion of this could be much simplified.

MR. GRAF: Not unless we give up serving the last floor with the elevators, and I don't think that would be done.

MRS. SMITH: There are just two elevator towers?

MR. GRAF: Yes, and these are stair towers which are 7 foot 6 high from the floor.

MR. SALGO: The answer is really yes, with the exception of the elevator.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you, gentlemen, very much. We will take it under consideration.

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Becker has just arrived, and he represents the Kennedy Center.

(Whereupon, the delegate for the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts entered the room.)

MR. BECKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Stone, and Mr. Ketchum, I told them it was 11:00 o'clock, and they are flying in from New York so they may be here momentarily.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In that case, we had better postpone any further consideration of this until they get here. I misunderstood, I thought they were right outside. We'd better wait for Mr. Stone.

MR. BECKER: Thank you very much, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What is the next one?

MR. ATHERTON: The Federal Reserve Board, but they are not here. We are running ahead of schedule quite a bit now, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Is anybody else out there?

MR. ATHERTON: There are only two more that and the Georgetown heating and cooling plant.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We will go into executive session until Mr. Stone arrives, and we are doing it only because he isn't here, but we can continue some of our private discussions until he gets here.

MR. GRAF: Can I come in and listen.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Not to our private discussions.

MR. GRAF: I mean when Mr. Stone arrives.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Surely, he will be appearing in public session just as you.

(Whereupon, the Commission went into Executive Session.)

MR. WALKER: No press now.

MR. SASAKI: It seems to me I think what they were saying today is in accordance with the fact, at least as I remember it, that the Planning Commission had approved something higher. We, through many struggles and many meetings and so forth insisted on the 140, plus the penthouse height, and the uniformity aspect, and that is our position now.

I am depending on my memory, but I just want to state this again to see whether Gordon, or somebody else, remembers it but it seems to me this was our position on the thing. Charles, you probably remember it better.

MR. ATHERTON: I think I can clear this up.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are talking about what we approved.

MR. ATHERTON: We approved this much right here. There was a letter that said that no building should exceed the height of 150 feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Whose letter?

MR. ATHERTON: The Commission of Fine Arts' letter, and that was in the summer of 1963--the fall of 1963.

MR. WALKER: Can I get clarification? You keep talking about the whole project. My understanding was that you approved this, that and that, and when you speak of the whole project do you mean you approved the height of this building?

MR. ATHERTON: It was never officially acted upon.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We set a standard that it never would be any higher than that, you know, and--

MR. WALKER: It might not be that high.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We did not specify. All I can tell you is exactly what we did. We said nothing could be above 150 feet for the whole project.

Exhibit F

Exhibit C

MR. WALKER: Does this imply that you approve its being that high?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Not at all.

MR. ATHERTON: In fact, in each action on these buildings it was specifically stated that particular action was on that building. I mean, it was made clear in fact, in the letter, that everything applied to that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have approved each building as this has gone along.

MR. WALKER: One last question. You have no commitment as to the height of that last building?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely no commitment to anything on that building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I say something?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You may.

MR. BUNSHAFT: In the first place, we are not talking legal things and I don't agree with anything you have said, Bill. I think this project was submitted in its early stages as an overall project. I am not talking about letters, I am talking about professional people talking to each other.

It was submitted; at one time it had designs where these buildings stepped down. Let's forget this letter business. That building stepped down, it was a circular thing. It stepped down; this thing stepped down, and we

didn't like any of it. So, this project got into the talking stage and it was approved in its general concept, just as it is shown right here. It may not have been written that way, because we reserved the right. We were afraid we might bugger up some reservations, or something, but in general principle--whether it was written or not--we agreed to this now, Bill, whether it was written or not and it doesn't matter.

If we want to be nasty we can; lower, raise, or do whatever we want here but, in general, we agreed to this. So, I don't think we ought to mislead Mr. Walker, who has not been through this hocus-pocus, and is trying to catch up that he can't do it by reading the material.

As far as I am concerned, these people are so tricky that if we wanted to be nasty and lower it, or something, we could if we wanted to. Now, I'd like to talk about this design. There is this notch that they have had on the whole project. You see this notch? We talked yesterday about possibly lowering this, you know, we talked about maybe we'd like to make this a little lower.

I think this notch is kind of a sacred thing, sort of unifying this project, and I think if you lower this at all you are going to bugger up the proportion of this building, and if it weren't for this sudden screaming about the Kennedy thing I don't think anbody architecturally, in his

right mind, would change this building from what is shown here.

There are two parts to this, this part here I think is as good a proportion as we can get. You take that photograph over there, and visualize taking two or three floors out, it would look kind of silly to have this notch without two floors above it, so it is a question of proportion to this building.

MRS. SMITH: How do you feel about the roof structure?

MR. BUNSHAFT: My feeling on that, again, they are trying to do--let's go into the history of that, too. I don't think there was a member of the Commission before that was in love with any of the architectural details. It was a reluctant feeling, the balustrades, and everything, gets you kind of ill. The whole concept.

If this were a Government project, we'd have probably eventually gotten rid of the architects through various devices, and here we have Professor Morrietti, a second rate Italian modern, and so all we have done is try to scale it down as much as possible. The balustrades, for example, he had in different shades and material. This lowerr part was one color, and you'd be amazed at the fights we have had with these fellows to approve this, and they keep talking and so it has been a battle. I am answering you, so it is a certain kind of spaghetti.

My own feeling is that it ought to continue. I think we could get them to scrape out these little balconies. It is, actually, kind of a nice idea for people in a penthouse to have a roof garden and if it is a long distance these things tend to disappear. But, even if they do show it seems to me it would be more unified to have the same kind of effect here, as in here. You know what I mean. If we were doing the whole thing over, you might say let's scrape the whole roof.

MRS. SMITH: What about those divisions? I don't think they are down below.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Those round things, you know.

MRS. SMITH: They don't show here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They are the dividers for the balconies.

MR. BUNSHAFT: These things sickened us. We fought on that. They had, I think, three or four different kind of rail details for each level, and I myself think it would be nice if we could get them to correct it on the whole project.

MRS. SMITH: Might you not find it very difficult, not being familiar with the previous discussions, but one of the most disturbing elements is that divider. Could you insist that that be taken off?

MR. BUNSHAFT: That they'd take them off or make

them straight, just to get this cornice down through. I think the basic issue, Bill, as I said yesterday you know it might be a good idea to study lowering this; I, personally, don't feel it is right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would hope that finally we were orienting our discussions toward the architecture, toward the massing of this building in its relation to the Kennedy Center. We are not a judicial body. We are not a court. We want to express our opinion on all of these issues, and that is our problem.

MR. BUNSHAFT. This is the best solution to finish this job; what do you think?

MR. WALKER: Could I speak to this. I live in Washington, and we see this all the time. We hear it all the time from people; friends; professional; lay people, that these are among the ugliest buildings ever build in Washington.

I admire Mr. Bunshaft's architectural knowledge, and I wish I didn't feel as strongly as I do, and I am such a new member I ought not to speak at all, but I am speaking with a fervent conviction when I say I admire immensely the high standard that this Commission maintained yesterday regarding the building that I don't think is bad, the AIA building, and on various other matters.

Now, you say to them go back and redesign buildings

that aren't good. You all tell me that you don't like this building; that you are sick of it; that it comes out of a long struggle, and it is better than it might have been, but nevertheless none of you feel that it is any good.

This building is the biggest of all. It is going to dominate this group. I think that your problem should be that building right there, but I can't understand why when you go to these other people and say, look, redesign this; you have got to come back with something better than that, why you permit these people simply because they aren't government people, simply because it is an Italian architect, simply because there has been a general sort of approval of the concept, why you won't be as rigorous and as ruthless with them as you have been--quite rightly--with the other people that have come in.

MR. SASAKI: Can I answer, respond, Mr. Chairman? I think we are, in a way, a review committee and we try to exercise certain judgments. Judgments are always value judgments, and there are many factors that color one's values or judgments.

In this particular case, I think at the outset we insisted on a presentation of an overall scheme because we refused to judge on an individual basis. So, it seems to me that it was at our own insistence that we asked for a total presentation of all the scheme, and then it is true we approved

the buildings individually.

But, it seems to me that we have really a commitment and that is why it is different than the AIA building or any other building. I think that, in this particular case, the commitment was made before the Kennedy Center. So, I think that if we don't have some sense of regularity, and dependency, I don't see where people will again trust our judgment.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what you say is probably true. This is one of the first jobs that was presented to us, and we were feeling our way, and we were not too educated as to how tough we could be. That is why I frankly told you that we never were in love with this.

I think that if this whole project was started, and came before this group, I think we'd turn it down stone cold, and we wouldn't even get into discussions of balconies, because I think we'd throw the whole thing out.

This is, I think, one of the first things this group met on so I don't think we can defend ourselves too well. I think it was just a matter of feeling our way. In fact, at that time, we were trying to get the best we could out of the architects that were there. You can't take a bad painter and make him into a Cezzane.

We did, eventually, turn down things. We tried to get better architects--that is the only way you can criticize

the architecture and architects--otherwise they won't understand what you are talking about. We tried to get it a little more American, but we realized who we were dealing with, that we weren't going to change this Morrietti--or whatever his name is--so I don't think we can defend ourselves as we can in the work we have been involved in, shall we say, the last three years. So, I think that your statement is correct.

Now, I think there is a thing called unity. I think this project needs--has to have that building as it is even though the others may not be what we love. I think it would be terrible, for example, to introduce another architect to do another concept of that last building. It might be beautiful in itself, but it might destroy the unity of this thing.

The Kennedy Center, the things across the bridge, and these other buildings already built, we can't suddenly start getting into an entirely new project. So, it is my feeling we might as well go along with it as a unit and I think this is it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Wait a minute, the speakers are lining up.

MR. SASAKI: I want to make one PS to this, to my comments. A commitment was made, and I don't apologize for what we have done, because a commitment was made by a pre-Walton commission. It really was.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Of course it was.

MR. SASAKI: The scheme was approved, the highlighs were approved, so we have been working with a commitment made by a prior Commission, and we felt obligated to have this continuity.

MRS. SMITH: The basic form of it?

MR. SASAKI: The whole scale.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We were obligated, but we don't feel so.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I thought this was ours. Then, it is not as bad as I put it. I am sorry.

MR. SASAKI: I am proud of what we have done, actually.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am sorry, I thought we started it. This makes it even better. I am sorry.

MR. SASAKI: That really is a commitment, so we have been carrying through the handiwork.

MR. ROSZAK: It seems to me any further discussion is purely academic. However, in view Mr. Walker's strong objection I would like to ask just precisely what he would do as an alternative?

MR. WALKER: I am not an architect, so I will answer you indirectly.

MR. ROSZAK: Why not directly?

MR. WALKER: As I say, the Fine Arts Commission

does not design buildings. They say that a building is bad, and gives reasons why it is bad, and then it is up to the architect to redesign it.

If Mr. Bunshaft were to design that building, I'd approve it sight unseen. A bad unit seems to stand out worse, particularly when you have a good building and I don't want to be put in the same position that you gentlemen were with regard to a prior commitment, which compelled you to agree on that building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, no, there is no such--

MR. WALKER: The impression is that everyone has an impression that you are at fault for having approved that. Even the David Finley Commission approved it, and here we are as two new members to vote on a building that according to the papers, and everybody else, there is no commitment on. That we are going to approve the building, and I am never going to vote for that building. We are asked to approve a building which we think is a building that is going to seriously, and adversely, affect the appearance of Washington. I just can't vote for that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There is no reason you should. No one is soliciting your vote. We do not solicit votes.

MR. WALKER: I know that, Bill, I am just trying to state my position hoping that I might persuade you to come along.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is just a bull session, because you are not going to change your mind and neither are we. You said something about an ugly building. In London, every single building--99% of them--are ugly, but when you put them altogether there is a certain nice, pleasantness about London. A great building in here is not going to help what is already built.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If you carry the argument a little further, if we'd just line the Potomac with further buildings like this, they will be beautiful. I am only kidding.

MR. ATHERTON: Could I, for the record, to protect the Commission's history here say that Mr. Finley's Commission actually made a very strong effort to get this to be a part of the park system. They were completely opposed to the whole project, so I think it is a fair statement to introduce here at this point.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In memory of our predecessors.

MR. WALKER: I can't understand how this Commission, and now with one member of a third Commission being opposed to it, that yet the project is being continued.

MR. BUNSHAFT: And so is the Kennedy Library, there isn't a single professional man that thinks it is any good.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Don't brush aside the fact that

there was total disapproval of the architecture, don't ignore that. You are now brushing this one aside.

MR. WALKER: I don't want to brush it aside.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Every professional involved in it has disapproved this thing, and it is still going to be built.

MR. WALKER: The Commission is on record as having disapproved it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The building has never been submitted to us.

MR. ATHERTON: The Commission approved the Kennedy Center earlier prior to--

MR. BUNSHAFT: We have never had that before us. It never came up here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The reason it was never up before us is because they knew we would disapprove it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If this were a Frank Lloyd Wright project, no architect probably would touch it. He maybe would have built something worse than this if he had lived but--

MRS. SMITH: I am afraid my opinions are sort of in between here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Unfortunately, we have to say yes or no.

MRS. SMITH: I don't think there is another form

of the building which would solve it, but I think that the side next to the Center something could be done to clean up those dividers, and some of the details there.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think it would be nice to hack away at that, I agree. Also, I will tell you if you didn't tell them you agreed to the cornice line, but you were thinking about it, they'd do anything.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They'd paint it blue.

MRS. SMITH: As long as you keep this, which is a unifying thing, and get a simple form, it would help greatly.

MR. WALKER: I am just curious here. In this 1963 report it says:

> "The members of the Commission were of the opinion that the building would be too tall according to present plans, as it all appeared to be nearer the 130 foot level than the 90 foot limit allowed by the present zoning regulations."

Actually, I think it is still higher than 130 feet.

> "This would result in an over-powering mass of buildings, where the lower building should prevail."

This is the Commission speaking, I think.

"A greater variation of heights of the buildings was desirable in order to avoid the dullness of a uniform skyline."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is a previous Commission.

MR. ATHERTON: The previous Commission approved this plan, plus the variety of heights in the buildings. I think Mr. Sasaki would verify that.

MR. SASAKI: That was approved before I came.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are getting out of it, too. I didn't want to say anything.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, I was the first member of this so-called Commission, and when I came the action had already been taken; approval had been taken, so I remember--that is why I remember it more strongly than I think you do, Gordon.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It was over five years ago. You have been on five years. I think it is going to be interesting if you keep on reading these old things, because you will refresh your memory of the things we have done.

MR. ATHERTON: They are here now.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There is no reason why we don't hear Stone and company now.

MRS. SMITH: I think a letter should be made up on all the details, and so forth.

(Whereupon, the delegation for the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts entered the room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Becker, are you the leadoff man?

MR. BECKER: I am the leadoff man, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are in public session now.

MR. BECKER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Ralph E. Becker and I am General Counsel and Trustee for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Mr. Stevens, our Chairman of the Board of Trustees is also Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, and he has asked me to express his regrets that he could not be present today. As a matter of fact, I have to express my own because it is very difficult for me to substitute for him. But, unfortunately he had a previous commitment with the First Lady, Mrs. Johnson, and he is enroute to Minnesota right now, and Mr. Stevens has asked me to submit his statement to the Commission, which he prepared, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit my statement and Mr. Steven's statement with the attachments for the members of the Commission, and for the record, and then if I could just highlight a few statements--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: They will be put in the record and we will read them.

MR. BECKER: There are sufficient for all the

members of the Commission. Now, Mr. Stevens and I on behalf of the Center are opposing the application of Watergate for their proposed Building No. 1, also designated as Stage IV. Mr. Stevens' position is summarized, very briefly, in the following.

"The Kennedy Center regrets the necessity of opposing the application for the construction of Building No. 1, as proposed by Watergate. But, the Trustees feel strongly that the Center building should not be dominated by a nearby commercial development. The Trustees hope that it may be possible for the developer to make an economic use of a sharply scaled-down building; but it should be emphasized that the developer elected to proceed with the other stages of the development with full knowledge of the Center's position, and the potential economic consequence should a scaled-down building be required.

"Indeed, the developer could not but have been aware of the relations between his plan, and the original building concept, as well as the present design. With the exception of the dome, the height of the old and new concepts does not greatly differ. The construction of the Kennedy Center, as you all know, is well under way whereas Watergate has not received the building permit for construction of Building No. 1.

"In addition to these considerations, Mr. Stevens feels there is a substantial change in the public and

professional approach to environmental architecture. As Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, Mr. Stevens points out that we are now making an extensive study into this field of environmental design.

"He also points out that a Pennsylvania Avenue Commission has been created by Executive Order, and permanent status has passed the Senate and is pending in the House. In addition, President Johnson has authorized the Secretary of the Interior to study the Potomac River Valley from Appalachia to the Chesapeake, including a parklike setting for the Potomac as it passes through the Nation's Capital. A report to the Secretary on this study was filed this week."

And Mr. Stevens appeared before the Zoning Commissionof the Nation's Capital, as well as the National Capital Planning Commission, all of which wasn't publicized until the Sunday papers.

"The position of the National Council on the Arts, the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission, and recommendations of the Potomac Study Committee, are all factors which should be seriously considered before a building permit is granted for Building No. 1.

"On the basis of all these factors, in addition to the relationship of this commercial development to the national memorial for President Kennedy, Mr. Stevens recommends that a study and report be made as to the advisability of

erecting this building at all before any action is taken which might adversely affect a permanent plan for the banks of the Potomac."

And I just received from the National Capital Planning Commission--which I'd like to file for the record--a "Report of the Zoning Committee", of the action which they have taken, in which they have unanimously adopted the recommendation of Mr. Stevens, and they have authorized a three months study in connection with the recommendation, and all incidental questions.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good; that will be incorporated.

MR. BECKER: Also, I have received this morning a copy of a letter that was sent to Mr. Arthur B. Hatton, from the Park Service, in which the Associate Regional Director in connection with a request from the Zoning Commission Executive Director, who sought their views like they are seeking the views of the Fine Arts Commission, and in the first paragraph it says:

> "We have completed our review of the "Watergate" project described in Board of Zoning Adjustment No. 9393. This Service wishes to support the position taken by the Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts that the Watergate Building No. 1

be limited in total height to an elevation below the cornice height of the Center building."

And, then, the last paragraph said that they support the resolution adopted by the National Capital Planning Commission, asking that the BZA and the Zoning Commission"withhold action until a new study can be made of the relationship between the proposed building No. 1, and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts."

I'd like to make this carbon copy of the letter a part of my report.

Now, unfortunately, I missed Mr. Graf's presentation but based upon the position taken by Watergate before the National Capital Planning Commission I would like to mention just a few points briefly.

It is unfortunate that the Center is required to take such a strong position against Watergate, particularly when such opposition could have been avoided. I emphasize that there have been alternatives possible during the past five years. The Watergate development could have proceeded in its various stages of construction, increased the floor areas, and at the same time satisfied the public interest, and the interest of the Center and not having an overpowering structure at the doorstep of a national monument.

Now, the Zonimg Commission Order of July 17, 1962,

specifically provided a condition which was for the benefit of the Center, and that the height of Building No. 1 may be adjusted after obtaining the views of the various agencies, such as yourselves.

Now, Watergate has followed--by its own choice--a course of action for the past three years whereby the height of Building No. 1 has been left unresolved, while the other structures have been completed or have approached completion.

At last week's session before the NCPC, the attorneys for Watergate pleaded surprise. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I have a report which I don't want to incorporate at this time, which I refer to as Exhibit D, which was filed before the NCPC which contains a record of the correspondence and relevant material, and hearings, before the BZA for July, August and September 1964.

I, personally, appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals on behalf of the Center in which I urged that the Watergate people resolve the question of the height of Building No. 1. Watergate pleaded that it was premature, that they have not filed application for the building, and that they will do so in early 1965.

I pointed out at that time, and again on several occasions before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, that every

specifically provided a condition would exclude the benefit of the cancer, and left the decision to [illegible] to be adjusted after considering the views of the various agencies, such as [illegible].

[illegible] mentioned that [illegible] the new [illegible] course of action for the [illegible] of [illegible] Building Act. I was [illegible] unresolved, until the other enactments [illegible] completed to [illegible] completion.

At last week's meeting before the [illegible], the [illegible] for [illegible] [illegible]. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I have a report which I don't want to [illegible] at this time, which I refer to as [illegible] the work within [illegible] of the [illegible] relevant material, and [illegible] before the [illegible] August and September [illegible].

I, personally, appreciate being [illegible] having [illegible] to speak to [illegible] that the [illegible] specific [illegible] of the [illegible] of Building Bo. 1. Mr. [illegible] stressed that it was [illegible], that they have not fitted [illegible] the [illegible] and that they will do so in early 1970.

I pointed out at that time [illegible] concerns before the [illegible] and, [illegible]

time they appeared in the last few years I appeared, and I opposed the application. I pointed out to them that the day will come when they are going to talk about economic loss, and other questions, which they raised last week and I am sure they raised again now. They had the opportunity.

Moreover, we had a meeting specially called by representatives of the Watergate and our own Executive Committee in New York in March of 1965, in an attempt to resolve the height question of Building No. 1. I pointed out the position of the Center, and it was diametrically opposed as far as Watergate was concerned and, of course, we deplore the fact that since we are neighbors and all of us are merely public officials, and we are interested in a public building, that on the other hand we recognize the economic facts of life in connection with the Watergate development.

However, for three solid years--as a matter of fact it was five as far as the question of height is concerned--for three solid years I have urged, on behalf of the Center, to resolve this question. Last March, they came in before the BZA and they did ask for an increase in square footage in one of the areas, which was an increase of 20 or 30,000 square feet, and overall they have increased the square footage by about 92,000 square feet in one way or another, either by diminishing colonnades, or reducing balconies, and thereby increased the rentable space by 92,000 square feet by special request to the BZA, and I think it does not

behoove them to plead surprise when they have been urged in writing, and in person, and every form that is humanly possible to resolve this question to which they now plead surprise, and I do not feel that kind of a question is important.

Now, with respect to other areas that may be raised I would like to reserve my right to speak upon them as the question may arise. But, at this time, I'd like to introduce Mr. Edward Stone, our architect, and we also have with us Mr. Maurice Ketchum, Past President of the American Institute of Architects who appeared before the National Captital Planning Commission, and I'd appreciate it if you would hear their views.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'd be happy to.

MR. STONE: Thank you very much. Do you mind if we rearrange the props here a little bit?

MR. ROTH: This model was prepared by Mr. Stone's office, and the Watergate buildings were prepared and put on this model by the Watergate people.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, my clients have indulged me in the luxury of speaking for myself. I don't need to point out to you, since you are the custodians of the physical destiny of Washington, that all the memorials to our late Presidents, whether it be Washington, Lincoln or Jefferson, or Theodore Roosevelt Island,

the future memorial to President Roosevelt, all exist in parkland settings, and free of any commercial inroads.

There is a long, lamentable history involved here, but this building is not built yet. As you heard, we presented this problem to the Planning Commission, and Mr. Stevens recommended to them that further consideration be given to the construction of this building, and it is my belief that this building should never be built.

I keep reminding myself that this is the richest country in history, and while democracy is a rather awkward way to get anything done I have faith that maybe someone will be able to reimburse the Watergate people for this land which would be very useful to the Kennedy Center.

You see the character of this all free of structures, and this is what I would consider ideal, and with prayer and patience maybe within the next three months some way could be found to make the adjustment, with Watergate--with the Watergate people--to purchase this land. At least we will have a temporary reprieve.

Now if, however, something along those lines cannot be worked out there is this historic question of cornice lines. As you will recall, there have been various recommendations to beat the game and one fellow was able to do it by inventing that roof that contained three or four floors. So, I think the cornice line is the right way to

measure the relative height of buildings, since this involves the vertical surface of the building that you see from eye level.

At the time we showed this project to President Kennedy, this ominous thing was not in the picture. He expressed concern that this building not be higher than the Lincoln Memorial. We had a long wall set up with a drawing of the facade of the Kennedy Center, together with the Lincoln Memorial, and this offered him reassurance that the then National Cultural Center would not tower above the lines of the Lincoln Memorial.

You can see that the cornice line is lower, both as to the main block of the building and of the penthouse. The cornice line of the Kennedy Center is 110 feet above the zero representing the Potomac. The height of the proposed Watergate project is 150 feet above the zero of the Potomac, with two twenty foot penthouses above that.

The penthouse, so-called, is in reality so close to the surface of the building that I think 90 odd percent of the building--rear of the Building No. 1--is covered by the penthouse, so in reality I would say visually the cornice line is at 150 feet.

I appreciate all of the problems that are involved in arbitrarily cutting down the height of a commercial building, and perhaps the recommendation that they

adhere to the 110 foot cornice line, which is our recommendation, would mean that this was economically completely unfeasbible. So that, again, would lead you into the belief that this land should eventually be acquired by the United States, and the building be given a proper park like setting.

In our appearance before the Planning Commission, I asked that Maurice Ketchum, if he would, present an objective view to them since he was with the American Institute of Architects, and has been working on other problems here in the Capital, and maybe you'd like to hear from him.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'd be delighted to.

MR. KETCHUM: Thank you, Mr. Stone. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission; I am here, as Ed said, I am here this morning because of my interest in environmental architecture, particularly in relation to Washington.

Now, this is under construction (referring to model) this has been built, and this might be built. But, this great sweep of greenery here and this adequate distance here, form--in my belief--a good setting, a partial setting to be sure, for a memorial to a beloved President. The only one he will have, according to an Act of Congress.

I believe that the Pennsylvania Avenue plan, the revived planning, or replanning, of the Mall; the revived waterfront planning for Georgetown, all of which projects

I helped to rally professional support for--I no longer speak for the Institute--but I would say that the Institute would not be so far apart from my opinion, I believe that architecture is three dimensional. All this talk about a facade, whether it is this high, or that high, is important perhaps but it isn't the facade alone. It is the whole space, and I think that this is not the answer and this is.

I plead for reconsideration. After all, perhaps this should have been done long ago, perhaps not, but at least it hasn't been done and I think this is the last chance to thoroughly study the arrangement, the height, area and space along the banks of the Potomac, and around the Kennedy Center, which I think would be in the public interest regardless of the individual merits of this building, that building, and this building.

This is a public monument, and this is the environment it ought to have. This is about all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much.

MR. KETCHUM: Unless there are some questions.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you have any more people to appear, Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: No more, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I didn'tknow whether this was a cutoff point or not.

MR. BECKER: This is our position, and we reserve the right to reply.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do the Commission members have questions to ask?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am not a historian but I understand, Bill, and I think you'd better give me the information that it was originally proposed that this whole site of the Watergate was for a park; isn't that right?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This was very private.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what you are talking about, Maurice, is not for us. I think all you have to simply do is find out what Watergate wants for this land, and get the Government to pay for it. I don't think that is a problem for the Fine Arts Commission.

I think that is all very charming, and if that could be done I am sure everybody here would be delighted, but we are not in that phase of it. Number two, and I am just speaking for myself, this Watergate project as it is shown on this model with the buildings there has been around a long time, and whether Building No. 1 was ever officially approved, and the exact height, is a detail. But, it has been around as a total concept. It was around as a concept when this Kennedy Center was being designed, and to suddenly get concerned about it to me, from an architectural standpoint, seems rather strange. They should have been concerned about it

when they were designing the Kennedy Center.

MR. KETCHUM: I am not really the one to answer that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Your statement that you made here, and I think we are concerned as much about the quality of Washington as anybody involved in this room, and outside of this room, but there must be some answers to these questions. You know, the way it is presented you'd think that the Watergate people suddenly came in with this monster, and are spoiling this beautiful Center. There is nobody, any professional man, who would deny it would be lovely to have a park here, but somehow when this land was acquired for this Center there should have been some screening done then, not at this time.

This is just historically I am talking about. It doesn't solve the problem, but I think we ought to get it straight for some of these so-called records, and I think going to hearings and asking when they are going to determine the height, the fact that there was the intention to have a building there, whether it would be 120, 140, or what, there is a building there and it is quite close to the Kennedy Center and somebody should have been worried about that when they were doing the Center.

MR. BECKER: I am not a custodian of history, but I'd like to state for the record, Mr. Bunshaft, certain

when they were changing the Kentucky Derby.

MR. DOCKERY: I'm not really sure how to answer

that.

MR. DOCKERY: [illegible] I'm not sure

what I think we are supposed to be doing. I

understand we already [illegible] but I'm not sure

this room, but there were [illegible] Derby

[illegible] Louisville [illegible] I'm not sure

[illegible] there are [illegible] I'm not sure

[illegible] but someone [illegible] Derby

[illegible] Louisville [illegible] I'm not sure

[illegible] there should have been [illegible]

at this time.

This is just objectively I'm asking about

[illegible] give the [illegible] I would [illegible]

[illegible] for some of those [illegible] I'm

going to [illegible] and maybe we'll [illegible]

the night, the [illegible] there was [illegible]

building there, whether it would be [illegible]

is a building there are [illegible] the [illegible]

there and somebody should have [illegible] I

they were doing the [illegible].

MR. DOCKERY: I'm not a [illegible]

[illegible] to apply for the [illegible]

facts. At the time that Watergate sought a development of this ten acres, they came up with Article 75, and we gave them certain things. What happened is when they did obtain approval, there was a condition imposed in that Order. That Order, in 1962, said this and this is where Watergate should have acted with prudence. It said that, with respect to the height of this building, Building No. 1,

> "The height of this building may be adjusted after obtaining the views of the Fine Arts Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Park Service * * *"

And in addition to that I think ultimately it must go to the Zoning Commission because the variance is more than 5%. So, therefore, in answer to your question, sir, Watergate when they appeared after, for example, our site plan was approved I urged them to resolve this question in 1964 and 1965. Therefore, in answer to your question everything that is established stems from the Zoning Commission Order, and if they want the Zoning Commission Order to be paramount then that supercedes anything that we are concerned with.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We can only talk about the Fine Arts Commission. What things the Zoning Commission does is their business. As far as my memory of it, it is this. The

Commission, in its present composition, except for the two new members have been here four years, and these projects have been approved by the previous Commission. I don't know anything about the details of the heights, and we have had this before us for four years, this Westgate or Watergate, and there has always been a building there. Everybody knows there has been a building there, and whether the height has been determined in legal hearings, or what not, is of no consequence.

The real issue is there has been a building there, and now you are saying you don't want a building, or a smaller building and it seems to me--and I am talking for myself--this should have been brought up four years ago, whether the height was exactly 120 or 130, and you are talking about eliminating the building and I really just want to straighten it out. These two have been around for four years at least.

MR. BECKER: May I say this--I can't speak for Mr. Stevens--Mr. Stevens wrote this report but let me say this. I have worked with Mr. Stevens for the last six years. Now, he has done a great deal with respect to many things and is leaving a great heritage with respect to culture and the cultural environment. He is the one that brought up the question of making this recommendation, because the position we took right along, officially, was the height must be below

the cornice line of the Center.

Now, Mr. Stevens is the one who has done a great many things since the Act was passed, and at the present time he has brought up the question about environmental design, and the architecture, and I don't want to speak for him but--

MR. BUNSHAFT: The environmental design has been around for a long time. Is Mr. Stevens just becoming acquainted with it now in the last two years?

MR. BECKER: No one else has ever gone to Congress to ask for $139 million for the arts as he did as Chairman of the National Council for the Arts on this particular question, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's address ourselves to the question, please. I want to make it clear, first, that the Commission has taken no action on this application whatsoever. Each member, as they are speaking now, are just engaging in a general discussion. Our action will be taken later. I just want to have the record very clear.

MR. ROSZAK: I am impressed with one omission about this whole discussion. In cutting across all the comments that have been made, I would like to ask Mr. Stone directly, as a creative person, how he would feel if someone asked him to cut his building in half? Now, you may not agree with Mr. Morrietti but this man has a right to his

expression, and I think it is tremendously presumptuous to tell an artist what to do.

MR. STONE: Well, I have a compassion for fellow creative workers and in my humble opinion if the United States bought that land and left this open park area, the people who inhabit what exists there of the Watergate project would have more attractive living conditions.

MR. ROSZAK: We are not talking about that, Mr. Stone. We are talking about a very basic principle of an artist making a statement against another artist.

MR. STONE: I haven't said the buildings were ugly.

MR. ROSZAK: You are ready to amputate, you are ready to create major surgery on that building and defy the integrity of that man's statement.

MR. STONE: Well, this is my humble opinion that this is what is best for everyone, and I can only state it that way. If I have stepped on a fellow artist's toes, it is lamentable, but I think they would be better off and certainly the City of Washington.

MR. ROSZAK: I am sure the architect would not agree with you.

MR. STONE: Well,then, I am put in a position--a rather awkward position--but I think this is best for the people of the United States.

MR. ROSZAK: We are really speaking about the integrity of an expression that we hope we still have the freedom to entertain.

MR. STONE: Let it go that my behavior is deplorable.

MR. WALKER: Did the Kennedy Center trustees, or officials, make clear to the Fine Arts Commission or to any other public body that they wish the cornice line of this building to be as the same height as the cornice line of the Kennedy Center, and if so when?

MR. BECKER: Yes, sir; the answer, Mr. Walker, is yes. This exhibit which I have filed here, shows the desire was made known prior to the first time I appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals.

MR. BUNSHAFT: He is talking about the Fine Arts Commission.

MR. BECKER: This matter, sir, may I say that this matter has never come up before the Fine Arts Commission before, sir.

MR. WALKER: You have had no opportunity to present your case?

MR. BECKER: That is right, sir; because, you see, what happened when we appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals, the Watergate people said the matter was too premature so they never filed an application for the building

freedom to enjoy it.

departure.

or officials, make plans be the first area immediate [illegible] other public body that may have the [illegible] bridging to be on the same nature as the [illegible] Kennedy center, and if we want

MR. [illegible]: Let me just answer, Mr. [illegible] in Yes. This morning after I have [illegible] desire was made known prior to the first time I appeared before the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

MR. [illegible]: We're getting close to [illegible] closedsion.

MR. [illegible]: This matter, sir, may I say that this matter has never come to before the Zone Plan Commission [illegible] air.

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] and no opportunity [illegible] present your case?

MR. [illegible]: [illegible] to [illegible] what happened when we appeared before the Board of Zoning Adjustment the Watergate people and the others were not permitted as they never filed an application for the variance

permit. The Watergate must file an application for a building permit. What has happened is that the issue has now come up, because Watergate has filed an application for the first time in June.

MR. SASAKI: I had at least two questions, and they are somewhat similar to the ones previously asked. I think, at least here in the discussion of the Fine Arts Commission, we asked this basic question of the site acquisition. Originally, we thought the site for the Kennedy Center was too small. The second thing is the building design for the Kennedy Center, actually, is after the design of the Watergate project as I understand it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith, do you want to comment?

MRS. SMITH: I don't know, as a new member, but I'd like to ask Mr. Stone if the basic design, as it now is for the Watergate, didn't exist when you appeared to discuss the site acquisition, and stated that you could live with it? I just want to get that straight.

MR. STONE: Mrs. Smith, I never appeared before any official group in connection with the Watergate project, until I appeared before the Planning Commission and you today.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Did you file any statements before any of those?

MR. STONE: No, sir; in other words, this is the

first time that I have ever, as an architect and hired hand, had any chance to voice my opinion of this project before any formal governmental group.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Mr. Sasaki was on the previous Commission. He has been here five years, and he has just said something very quietly which I think ought to be repeated, that the Watergate project as a total design existed when you started on the Kennedy Center. So, that you were aware of that project as much as you are aware of the river and after five years, now, I think we just want to get that part straight because after five years you are now concerned, and it is too close.

MR. STONE: If I remember the timing of this Gordon, I started work on it in 1959 and this project did not have its inception until 1962, and again I must repeat that I have never spoken before any official group. Naturally, I spoke to my clients, and repeatedly, but I have never appeared officially before.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Ed, you were working on the design of this site in 1959?

MR. STONE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A much bigger earlier design. Now, I want to be sure that the dialogue between the Commission, and the Kennedy Center, runs its full course and that everyone says what they want to say. I keep getting signals from the

Watergate people, who are present, that they wish to reply or make statements. But, I want to be certain that we have every view expressed between the Kennedy Center and the Commission before I permit any of them to interject a comment. Is everyone satisfied that they have spoken their pieces? I hear no objection. Now, Mr. Watergate.

MR. SALGO: My name is Nicholos Salgo, and it is a pleasure to appear before you, and I'd like to express our appreciation for it.

There were two major elements which the members of the Commission were kind enough to bring up. One, the time and, second, the integrity of the design. Mr. Morrietti cannot be here to defend himself, and his project, and I surely can't because I am a layman. But, the design for the Watergate was conceived around and in conjunction with the then existing plan for the then Cultural Center, and particularly the present existing lines were inspired by Mr. Stone's work.

This was a great preoccupation to us, at the time when we had advanced to the building stage and found that, in effect, we were legally bound by an existing contract between the City of Washington and ourselves under Article 75 to build this project as it is now being built, and as it is now being proposed, and found that there was a complete major change

in the design of the Kennedy Center. Several opponents of the then proposed, and still in the proposal stage for the Kennedy Center, brought up this question. Several opponents brought up the question of nearness, and particularly when the new design was presented I heard the words used, "crowding of the Watergate."

For Mr. Stone's new design--I am now talking 1962--at the time when the Watergate finally, after three years of studies and negotiations, was approved by the National Planning Commission, and then the Fine Arts Commission, and I have in my hand quotations made at that time when the real chief concern--which was perfectly normal and extremely laudable for the developers of the ideas of the Kennedy Center, then the National Cultural Center--was to get an approval of the present site.

I have here a statement that was attributed to Mr. Stone, and if you will permit me I will read it. The dateline is September 20, 1962, the heading is "New Design for the Cultural Center is approved by the Fine Arts Commission."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: From what are you quoting?

MR. SALGO: City Life of the Washington Post, and it says; it talks about the interview between Mr. David Finley and Mr. Stone, and expresses great concern about the whole question, and the relationship of the two, "Stone said

he did not think the development would "'crowd in on us'" . . . "'I think it will look wonderful together with the Center.'"

MR. WALKER: May I have the page reference on this?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This will appear in our record. It has been read in.

MR. SALGO: Some of the members of the Planning Commission, it seems, were present when this interview took place. All that comes out, here, is that it is a question of integrity of design, the integrity of creating something completely new.

We, in Watergate, we are extremely proud of what we were able to do up until now. Again, I am a layman and I, myself, have criticized some of our aspects--exterior aspects--but the fact remains that that was one building. It is completely on one base, interconnected, interserviced and the amputation which you so correctly referred to is even worse, because it is a kind of amputation of a part of a body, and I can't see a functioning body with just parts.

We are not talking about a leg, or a foot, we are talking about the whole system. Somebody, very ably before, brought out that it is a question of half of the population living in the area and translated into services, garages, office building, hotel, and shopping center, it is a late date to be discussing this.

Mr. Becker brought out the question of advising

us in 1962 that we'd be neighbors, and I am proud and very happy that we were one of the earliest major contributors to the Center. It was in '64, two years later, when the objections started at the time when we were far advanced in our building, when we were far advanced and committed by a binding legal contract to build this development, or else suffer the confiscation loss, and have the land taken if we don't finish it up. We are, particularly now, hanging in a very peculiar situation where we have an obligation to build, and there are elements that tell us not to and, frankly, I don't know what the answer is.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much.

MR. SALGO: Just one more statement, excuse me. About the question of time, again, we had no date to change our plans because these plans were imposed on us for each building. The changes were aesthetical, and this Commission knows well that we were advised to change aesthetically our plans as we went along to conform to your design, but the time also went for the Kennedy Center from '64 on. There was ample time to intervene administratively, economically, or otherwise to create the funds, or the laws, or the action necessary to do something if somebody really wanted to exercise surgery on an architectural project. Thank you.

CHAIRM WALTON: Thank you. Now, does any member wish to question him?

MR. STONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no recollection of having made such a statement. Certainly, I never made it formally. It is a suicidal statement, and I doubt under any circumstances that I would be that foolish. I think the facts here may obscure the truth. Hasn't the whole set of circumstances, here, altered since this has become a memorial to a President.

I don't say that, architecturally, it wouldn't always be better without this building. But, the fact that it is now a memorial seems to me to be something which came along much later. As you recall, the President's tragic death came much later than the conception of this project, and I think in the eyes of the Congress and the American people this alters the circumstances considerably.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Four years ago, Ed.

MR. STONE: Yes, but it has been nine years.

MR. LIKENBURG: I am Counsel for the Watergate project, and I have only one or two brief remarks, and first of all Mr. Becker's statements are not accurate. The timing isn't accurate for the building permit. I don't know whether I ought to answer these--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is not the proper place.

MR. LIKENBURG: This is based on one of the questions that one of the members of the Commission asked as to timing, and the knowledge in this regard of this particular

project.

Prior to April of 1962, I think most of you know that we were before many agencies, and many commissions, in connection with the attempted approval of the zoning change, and the approval under Article 75, and in order to approve one thing it had to be handled as a package according to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Zoning Commission. In other words, the changing of the area to special purpose zoning, the closing of the streets, so that it would be one plot of ground.

Now, under Article 75 provisions we were permitted to proceed in four stages. We have completed two of the stages, are working on the third. It is being constructed now, and the fourth one is now--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We know this.

MR. LIKENBURG: Now, as to the agreement that was made between the United States, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, the National Park Service, of April 11, 1962, this was insisted upon by the Cultural Center, and by the National Park Service. I am reading, now, from paragraph 2 of the Agreement.

> "The Corporation is to provide support for the proposed relocated roadway of the Rockcreek and Potomac Parkway abutting the Corporation's

project.

remaining portion of square 9 * * *"

And square 9 is the plot 75,000 square feet at F street and the parkway.

"Along the boundary created for conveyances as provided in paragraph 1 to such elevations, and grades, as are deemed necessary by the National Cultural Center to connect with the proposed roadways and the plaza of the proposed National Cultural Center development at the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue by means of a wall, or suitable supporting structure, or fill.

"Provided, however, (a) should the National Cultural Center fail to notify the Corporation in writing on or about September 26, 1962, of the required elevation and grade of said proposed roadway, the proposed relocated roadway may be based by the Corporation's developers on the elevations, and grades, as they presently exist.

"(B) In the event the Corporation construction schedule should change, so

as to permit an extension of time from the aforesaid September 26, 1962 as provided in subparagraph (a) above, The Corporation will cooperate with the National Cultural Center to reasonably extend the time."

Which we did.

("C) In any event, it is mutually agreed between the parties that the elevation of such roadway shall not exceed elevation 26 at any point along said boundary and, (d) in the event that notice is given as aforesaid of the required elevations and grades of said proposed roadway, and the Corporation does not provide for the support of the proposed roadway, in accordance with said notice the National Cultural Center and/or the United States shall have the right to place upon the Corporation's property in square 9, to the extent it may be necessary to support the proposed relocated roadway of the Rock-creek and Potomac Parkway, adjacent thereto such fill and/or structure for the purpose

of supporting such proposed roadways." So, we were cooperating with them all along, and they knew and had approved.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you very much, gentlemen. We have a problem. We have some of the Governors of the Federal Reserve who have been waiting more than a half an hour, and we will have to ask you to terminate. I thank you very much for all of your time, and your information, and we will take this project under consideration, and give it--you can be certain--very careful consideration.

(Whereupon, the delegation for the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts left the room, followed by the delegation from the Federal Reserve Board.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Are the new or the old going to speak, or both?

GOVERNOR SHEPARDSON: Mr. Larson will start off.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have looked this over, you know, and you have come up before, and we have asked Mr. Bunshaft to open the discussion with you, the two of you.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't know if there is a need for a presentation. We have looked the drawings over, and unless you want to say something--

MR. LARSON: I think probably I should say something, certainly, on behalf of the Board of Governors. As a result of the June meeting, when you rejected any

a convenient date, so that is absolutely everything except Watergate.

MR. ATHERTON: Watergate is the only thing that remains to be acted upon.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: How do you want to proceed on this, Commissioners? Do you each have further statements to make, or discussions?

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask a few questions. After hearing their presentation, it seems to me the question of whether that building should be there or not is not within our purview. The second question of whether the building should be such a height, or not, that seems to be still open to question. That is the way I would determine it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is the way you would define the issue?

MR. SASAKI: I may be mistaken.

MR. WALKER: Can I ask for an explanation of why it isn't within our purview as to whether there should be a building there or not?

MR. SASAKI: I think it is within our purview but, again, in order to be--

MR. BUNSHAFT: Five years ago it was.

MR. SASAKI: To be consistent with the facts, I think if you can study the record the designers generally have been

a convenient date, so that it wholeheartedly encourages everyone

Watervagte.

MR. ADAMSON: Mr. Chairman, I have only three items

remains to be acted upon.

CHAIRMAN WALKER: How do you feel about proceeding to

this, Commissioners? Do you wish more thorough discussion of

each, or discussion?

MR. FARANI: Mr. Chairman, if I could make a few

questions. After hearing their presentation, I tend to

me the question of whether the building should be there

or not is not within our power. The zoning question,

whether the building should be moved a little, or that item

seems to be still open for question. That is the only I would

determine it.

CHAIRMAN WALKER: What is the only item would you

the issue?

MR. FARANI: I may be mistaken.

MR. WALKER: Can I ask for an explanation of why

it isn't within our purview as to whether there should

a building there or not?

MR. BERNET: I think it is within our purview on

again, in order to be--

MR. FONTAINE: Five years ago it was.

MR. CASSAN: To be consistent with the Master

Plan if you can study the matter the developers personally may

against the location of that building there, and Ed Stone has been one of the foremost promoters of that building there and on that particular site. He has been one of the principle defenders, and it seems to me to be a rather abrupt and rather strange view and, I think, not an entirely honest reversal of his stand, and I just can't be a party to this kind of a stand.

We were very much against this, so while I think it is within our purview it seems to me the facts have been already established.

MR. WALKER: This is just a technical matter, but I think it is sort of important. What I want a ruling on is whether we are voting on two things or one thing. Are we voting on whether it should be there--a building should be there--or not, or are we simply voting on a past decision that there should be a building there, in which case it really doesn't come up for review before our Commission--which may well be the case--and then that is one situation. Does that come up in our consideration?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There are many, of course, actions open to us actually. We can conceivably say that we wish to express no opinion until the Planning Commission's three month study is done. We can say that we do notthink that the construction of the final unit, as proposed, would be damaging to the Kennedy Center. This is a conceivable position. We can

recommend half a building. We have an infinite variety of courses that are possible to us. Each one of us has a personal history involved in every aspect of all of these buildings.

It is impossible to sort out all of the threads of what you said in 1962 and, you know, in 1959 somebody else said. Finally, we will certainly be guided by principles of integrity of one's word, or the Commission's word. We will be guided, I would hope, overwhelmingly by what is best for the City of Washington. Balancing all of these things will determine what we decide to do, but as far as a ruling--

MR. WALKER: This is all right, but having been on many committees in my life I'd say that if one was soliciting my vote I'd disagree with you 100%. It seems to me the purpose of this Committee is to solicit each other's vote for one's own particular position. I want to know, therefore, whether I should make an effort to solicit your vote that there should be no building there, and if that is not the issue then I am not going to try to solicit your vote. I don't think I am going to succeed, but this is a duty of the Committee members.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is a personal decision that you should make.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I will express how I feel. I have been involved in this project for four years. I don't give a

recommend half a building. My move in Lafayette Square to
courses over the possibility to see. Shall see it as use a
personal history involved in interpretation of well my check
building.

It is impossible to say if all is the interest of
what you say in 1920 and have in this position
said. Finally, we will continue to protect the
integrity of one's money in the Commissioner's room. We will
be guided; I would hope recommendations in that it best for
the city of Washington. Certainly the city plans should
determine what we decide is no, how we become a balance-

MR. MACKEN: While in the object, but having been
on many committees in my life I'd say that it was the
soliciting my vote I'd otherwise like you that. It seems to
me the purpose of this Commission is to solicit everybody's
vote for one's own particular position. I mean we know,
therefore, whether I should make an effort to solicit your
vote that there should be no building there, and if that is
not the issue then I am not going to try to solicit your
I don't think I am going to succeed, but this is a duty of
the Committee members.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It is a personal decision that you
should make.

MR. GOUGHARY: I will express how I feel. I have
been involved in this project for four years. I don't have a

damn what power we have. We have, as far as I am concerned, morally committed ourselves to that building, and I will be no party in changing it because some people have suddenly wakened up to something that has been around a long time. I think it is disgraceful, this whole performance, and as far as height goes we could legitimately--at least in my mind--aesthetically say we believe it ought to be the same height.

I think, in using that device, I think it would be very nice to do what Mrs. Chloethiel Smith has suggested and that is at least get the details on this kind of design, and it isn't a question of what we can do but I think it is a moral question of what we all know we have been doing for four years.

I don't think we can act like we are just being introduced to this project, because you know what is happening here is Mr. Stevens is suddenly waking up to this. I don't think Ed Stone, I think if he really believes what he said, he is an awful person. I think he has been put into this position and--

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, as long as we are stating positions, I would say my position will be basically similar to Gordon's, that I feel as though because of these committments the question can't be opened up, it is already decided, and the question of the height I would still leave open. But, again,

if I were to judge aesthetically I would say if we were going to change it we should have started sooner, and then throughout all of our discussions with the architects--and this was the instruction given by the Zoning Board--that the height ultimately be decided together with the discussion of the Fine Arts Commission, and they really did discuss this with us and we suggested this uniform height.

So, it seems to me that while that question is open I would vote for continuing this uniform height. So, my position would be basically the same as Gordon's. At least you have two views here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If we really are concerned, I think there would be no harm in them approaching Congress, or the President, or anybody about buying that land for an excessive amount and opening it up. But, that isn't our problem.

MR. SASAKI: By making the statement, it doesn't mean that we would resist their purchasing it. I think this would be perfectly all right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Any action that we take must not be subject to interpretation that we, for instance, if this is the will of the majority are insisting that that building be built, you know.

MR. BUNSHAFT: All we ought to say, if I may just start it as a dry run, is that we approve the height of the building number one, as shown on plan so and so, in conformance

with our previous general approvals, period, and then I would go on and say, however, we want to review in great detail all the details contained at a new time, not implying that we accept the details that went into the previous buildings. That is all we have to say. We want to get the idea of continuing in there.

MR. ROSZAK: I think it is also very important for us to recognize the meaning of the arts. I mean, after all, this is what we represent and whether we like one building or another is purely a subjective evaluation. I think it would be very bad if we went on record as establishing a precedent where it is possible for one architect to gouge the design of another, because he is in a favorable position at the moment to do so. I think this is disastrous and reprehensible.

MRS. SMITH: I am not clear in Article 75. I have read it, and I think I remember that somebody else is going to have to act.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Ours isn't the final word.

MRS. SMITH: According to Article 75, you have to build the whole or--

MR. BUNDSHAFT: The Italian representative was as honest as anybody in the room, for once, because it was on his side. I think he really stated it honestly, and all this other was just a bunch of stuff.

with the relative powers of Congress, Council, and even I seem
to be on one end. Hopefully we need to realize a power balance
all the details concerning it is that our Legislature
re assigns the present laws and into the executive functions.
There is all we have to say. We want to keep the issue
continuing in there.

MR. ROGERS: I think it is also very important
that we recognize increasing of the role. I mean also
ally this is what we experience and however the existing
e modified to merely a supportive system. I think it
would be very bad if we were to return to a centralized
processed where it is possible for one to dictate
the design of software, because we do it by managing
of the powers to do so. I think this is fundamental and
responsibility.

MR. SMITH: I've not chose to discuss it. I
have read it, and I think I remember that Georgia also is
going to have to act.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Mr. [illegible].

MRS. SMITH: Something to discuss it, [illegible]
until the whole ba-

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Texas representative was in
power as anyway in the House for about [illegible] year ago
also. I think he really stated it honestly, and all this about
was just a bunch of stuff.

MRS. SMITH: The other thing that concerns me, have read those statements, and so on, of Mr. Stone's and he says he never said them. I feel a little confused.

MR. ATHERTON: It is on the record that he didn't say them.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Stevens has just cooked up this thing, and they are all getting on the bandwagon, and don't know quite how to do it.

MR. ROSZAK: We had a meeting in New York about Stevens taking over the whole control of GSA, did you know that; absolutely.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Chloethiel, do you want to develop your position any more?

MRS SMITH: I'd only like to say the way I feel about this is I really agree with Gordon and, unfortunately, I don't think from everything I have heard that we can possibly say don't build a building. I think if they could get plenty of money, and can buy them out, we wouldn't say no.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That isn't before us. Nobody would disagree with making that decision.

MR. WALKER: Well, could I go on soliciting votes from my lone corner over here. If we do what Mr. Bunshaft suggests, and approve the building in principle at its present height, and so forth, we are going to somewhat handicap their efforts to get the money to buy the land. My proposal would be,

therefore, to do one of the alternatives which you have suggested, and that is to say that in view of the fact that the Planning Commission has asked for three months to study this matter, that we will consider it three months hence when their decision has been made. Otherwise, I think you are handicapping the efforts that are being made to raise the money to buy the property, and which you say you don't want to do.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Of course, that is a question for the whole Commission to decide, and if you would like to put that in the form of a resolution--

MR. WALKER: I'd like to put that in the form of a resolution.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: --we can debate it. Does anyone want to address themselves to this subject?

MR. SASAKI: Bill, Mr. Chairman, if I may I would go along with such a resolution, because again as we said there are two basic questions that are involved, and in the same way that we did with the heating plant, we tried not to involve ourselves in the heating plant, in the building, or site selection part, and I think that what we are doing is saying--postponing or deferring--but not really saying that we will refuse to make a decision.

I think this is perfectly all right, because I am involved at the present time in a sort of an arbitration

case, and the other party asked for an extension in time. So, I granted it because it was a reasonable thing to do to resolve this question. So, I see no harm; I see no sacrifice in doing it here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let me make one passing comment. The tenor of the view of the Commission are, now, very public. All of the press was here during our debating back and forth. It isn't as though, in a sense, we have deferred the decision. Both sides were present, and all the press. I just want to point this out.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what we might say is this, this was a subtle point you brought up about jeopardizing their acquiring the money which I doubt, but let's say they could get the money. I think there is--I am not for delaying for three months. I think we are just being chicken, and I think what we should do--if you really want to get at it carefully--is in light of the ownership of the various lands--I am not saying this properly--but I think we want to get in the point of the lands, the ownership of the lands that are being considered, in light of the Westgate--Watergate--ownership of the land, and in light of previous presentations that we approve it as it now stands.

This does not prevent consideration of the acquisition of the Watergate property by others and--

MR. ROSZAK: I think that is right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think we ought to protect this aspect of it, and I think we can do it by not delaying. I am not for delaying this. I think, myself, we have spent enough time on it and for once we ought to--

MR. SASAKI: May I ask this question. The submission that they did present, the Watergate people, is that a formal presentation to our Commission?

MR. ATHERTON: It was submitted really by the Board of Zoning Adjustments, and they were here only in defense of their submission.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It was referred to us by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We ought to treat it as a formal submission.

MR. SASAKI: If that is the case, it seems to me we ought to act on it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think it would be worth writing, and phrasing, it somehow or other to imply that this is the only course we have. You know, something about the land. Even though I don't like this whole Italian group, I think we must be decent. There is no reason for us to delay this just because somebody brought it up, and some other organization has decided to delay.

MR. WALKER: I seem to be the only one on my side. Delay doesn't worry me very much. When I lived in Rome, I

MR. WARNER: Delay during?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, I don't see why not.

MR. WARNER: Delay during?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, I don't see why not.

MR. WARNER: Delay during?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, I don't see why not.

learned that to get a building approved it took 17 years if you were lucky. The thing that worries me, and this is perhaps a personal matter now, you have all been on this previously--this involves the two new members--but if no one feels as strongly as I do--and I feel very strongly against this building--there should be some way of protecting my opinion, and judgment, because I have no commitment on this building. I never approved the building.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The vote was four to three, and we didn't have any publicity about who approved or who didn't. The Commission voted, and each member is free to make an announcement as a public position.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Each member is perfectly free to issue a statement; absolutely. They must always be free to issue a statement.

MR. WALKER: That is all I want to know.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You are not bound to support our decisions.

MR. WALKER: All right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You are always free to state what you think.

MR. SASAKI: Like the Supreme Court.

MR. WALKER: In the Supreme Court, you write a minority opinion.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Dissenter opinions are most

welcome. Well, now, there has been a modification suggested. Do you want your original resolution voted on?

MR. WALKER: I would like a vote on it; it hasn't been seconded yet.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We don't have to have one. Would you want to restate your resolution?

MR. WALKER: I will try. My resolution is in view of the fact that the Planning Commission has decided to study the request of the Watergate Corporation for the erection of this building, for three months, I would recommend that without prejudice one way or the other regarding the construction, or design, of the building that the Fine Arts Commission put off its decision until the Planning Commission has decided what it recommends.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All in favor?

(Whereupon, there was a show of hands.)

MRS. SMITH: It is a decision on what?

MR. WALKER: On whether or not there should be a building there. That is what the Planning Commission is considering; isn't it?

MRS. SMITH: That isn't up to us.

MR. WALKER: I am just postponing our decision until they have come up with a decision.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, if I could state what I am voting for it is this. That because it is a question of

site location, and so forth, and that it is the prerogative of the Planning Commission--if the Planning Commission has so acted--so that it seems to me that in deference to that Commission I would be willing to grant them that favor, and that is why I am voting for the thing while basically, as I said, I agree with Gordon and I think our views of today's discussion have expressed this.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: But this Commission--we have all been around here about four or five years, and not once have we ever worried about who comes first, National Planning or us and, in fact, Mr. Theory over at the National Planning is really mad at us because we have always reviewed things that sometimes haven't been necessarily approved for zoning or planning, and I think that is a rather thin thread on delaying it.

Our decision doesn't mean the building is going to be built. It only says that it aesthetically--as these people have submitted it to us--aesthetically conforms at least, let us say, I think it conforms to what they have previously submitted and we are approving it as a design. We are not approving it for zoning, because that isn't our authority, and if the planning people want to come up later and say, well, we are not going to allow them to have fourteen floors, or whatever it is, they will have to come back with a

new design to the Planning Commission, and after that has been approved they will come to us. But, what they are asking of us we are in a position to answer. That is my feeling.

MR. ROSZAK: Are we entertaining two resolutions?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, only one.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Let's vote on it, then. There are six of us here.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I want to be sure that everyone is clear what they are voting on, because if we approve this resolution no other action will be taken on this project.

MR. ROSZAK: I second Gordon's resolution.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Wait a minute, let's vote on Mr. Walker's resolution which is the delay for three months.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Each of these members can say something if they wish on the resolution.

MR. ROSZAK: I agree with the jurisdiction which is limited to our particular purview that has to do with the aesthetic values, and let's not get confused with other agencies, and delaying tactics, or political expedience. That should not enter into our thinking at all.

Therefore, I have a tendency to support the second one that has been suggested and--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now, wait, that confuses us.

MR. ROSZAK: Why?

MR. SASAKI: He is voting against Mr. Walker.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are voting against delay.

MR. ROSZAK: That is right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Smith.

MRS. SMITH: I don't like to do this because, again, I am in the middle but from all I have heard I feel that it would be wrong to delay until the Planning Commission action. I am afraid this last minute bringing up of the matter of the site should be avoided, and might shift the Commission's thinking.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Unless someone wants to say more, those in favor of Mr. Walker's resolution will raise their hand.

(Whereupon, there was a show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Those who are opposed.

(Whereupon, there was a show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Three to two against your resolution. Now, does someone want to proceed to--

MR. ROSZAK: You haven't voted.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Chairman doesn't except in the case of a tie.

MR. SASAKI: How about the resolution that Gordon stated before?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I will state it in my broken English and you can fix it up.

MR. MARKER: Do it before breakfast, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SUMMERHAYS: We are moving along quite nicely.

MR. ADAMSON: That is all.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Mrs. Fowler.

MRS. FOWLER: I don't like to be rude because [illegible]
I am in the minute but then all I have [illegible]
would be wrong to delay until our Chairman [illegible]
I am afraid that is entirely [illegible]
the site should be avoided. And about [illegible]
[illegible]
mushing.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Unless someone wishes to [illegible]
change in favor of Mr. Walker's resolution will [illegible]
heard.

(Whereupon there was a show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Those [illegible]

(Whereupon there was a show of [illegible].)

CHAIRMAN WILSON: Those to [illegible]
resolution. Now, does [illegible]

MR. KREZAK: You haven't voted.

CHAIRMAN WILSON: The [illegible]
can make it a tie.

MR. MARKER: How about the [illegible]
[illegible]?

MR. SUMMERHAYS: I will [illegible] in my [illegible]
and you can fix it up.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is not a public resolution, this is amongst ourselves.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That we approve the design submitted that conforms to the cornice line, and with the penthouses, as contained in the previous designs that have been approved and this is with regard to the general concurrence that we have given for the overall project verbally. That, however, we are not satisfied with the details and want a review of all exterior details, in great detail, as if this were a new project.

We are approving this solely on the basis of the design within the property ownership of this project. If there were to be any proposals for--and I don't know if we can get this in--but I will babble along--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is not to be interpreted as interfering with any efforts by--

MR. BUNSHAFT: If there were changes in the ownership of the land--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Just, specifically, acquisition of land by the Kennedy Center; there is no reason not to be specific about it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Something that does not preclude any agency from buying the whole damn thing and tearing it down.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now, to try and keep it clear don't you think it is appropriate that we voted right away on

this, so we can remember what it is we are voting for? Those in favor of Mr. Bunshaft's resolution please raise their hand.

(Whereupon, there was a show of hands.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: How can you vote for both?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Those opposed.

(Whereupon, there was a show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is four to one in favor of Mr. Bunshaft's resolution. Mr. Walker, I don't think that this will work against your position, actually. I think that it may help the people who wish to acquire the land to know that if they don't it is going to be built.

MR. WALKER: You have a good point.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Because they may always be banking on the fact it is never going to get through the Commission of Fine Arts anyway.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This statement of theirs, if Mr. Stevens had said that this building should be eliminated, or reduced, and that adequate compensation should be made by a government agency to these people, but Mr. Becker read all this and I can't get any sense of what it is.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are going to have to issue a carefully worded press release on this.

MR. WALKER: When will this be done?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Charley and I will try to do it this

afternoon.

MR. WALKER: As quickly as that? Is it necessary to do it as quick as that? Because I'd like to take advantage of what you said, if possible, and make a statement as a minority of one on the subject, and I'd like to submit this to you.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Certainly, and they should be issued together. We won't issue ours until you have written yours, but pending the issuance of a press release I think we all ought to hush up, in a word, you know.

MR. WALKER: Absolutely.

MR. SASAKI: Formally, we say ask the Chairman, and that centralizes the press people.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It will all pass through me, and Charley, and out to the press. I don't think that this applies to any other action we have taken today. They are all rather normal in the presence of the press.

MR. WALKER: Let me just ask one question. Falling back from position to position, you approved the height of the building in conformity with the other building. I hope the resolution doesn't show that that doesn't mean that you are not going to try to work on the design of the building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely; we are going to make it--in our letter to them, we are going to make it clear that we wish a review of all the architectural details very thoroughly.

MR. ATHERTON: I hope we can get this out, say, by tomorrow morning, because tomorrow afternoon there is a scheduled meeting with all the government agencies involved in this over at the Planning Commission, and really I couldn't discuss our position unless this has been done.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You and I will spend the afternoon on it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'd just as soon get at this right now. There is a tradition over the years for people who don't get what they like to make a statement. There is plenty of precedent. However, our strength has been a rather unifying force against a lot of these things, and I--

MR. WALKER: I couldn't regret it more.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think this idea of agreeing on everything that is of consequence is important.

MR. WALKER: My admiration for all of you is great, and I will be with you on 99% of the questions. But, it is too bad that I feel so strongly about something that comes up now.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This total strength has been well received, generally, and has been taken that we are trying to do a fairly good job and I just wonder from a broad policy view, not freedom of speech--

MRS. SMITH: I am just concerned that when people start trying to talk to individuals, and they get trapped, and I

21 September 1967

Dear Mr. Hatton:

In response to your request to review Building No. 1, Stage 4 of the Watergate Project, as required in Zoning Order of July 17, 1962, file number 62-19, the Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on September 20th, met with representatives of the Watergate Project and also representatives of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

After hearing lengthy presentations from both parties involved, the Commission voted general approval of the Building No. 1 with cornice line of 140 feet, in conformity with the other units of this project. The Commission stated clearly that this did not imply approval of all of the other architectural details which, of course, are subject to further presentation.

Furthermore, the Commission wishes to emphasize that today's action should not be permitted to affect efforts of the Kennedy Center trustees and other interested parties to acquire Watergate land adjacent to the Kennedy Center.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Arthur B. Hatton
Executive Director
D.C. Board of Zoning Adjustment
204 District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit G

NEWS RELEASE

Commission of Fine Arts
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C. 20240
Telephone: 343-5324

WASHINGTON: 20 September 1967

The Commission of Fine Arts today gave tentative approval to the last unit in the Watergate complex. The Commission's action, taken by a vote of 4 to 1, would permit a building equal in height to the existing units. The Commission told the Board of Zoning Adjustments that its action should in no way affect the efforts of [illegible] of the Kennedy Center to acquire part of the adjacent Watergate property sufficient to prevent the erection of this building.

The Commission's action was taken after hearing detailed presentations from Mr. Edward D. Stone, the architect, Mr. Ralph Becker, the general counsel for the Kennedy Center, as well as representatives of the Watergate Corporation.

Exhibit H

I would like to record my dissent from the decision of the Commission of Fine Arts to approve building number I as proposed by the Watergate Development.

In the published report of the Commission of Fine Arts of July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1963, it states on page 88 that

> "The members of the Commission thought the Lincoln Memorial and the proposed National Cultural Center should be the dominating structures in this area. The development of this land should be consistent with the parklike nature of the site. The unique location imposed obligations upon the developer which might not be imposed in a less prominent site."

This statement refers to the "cultural center." That center subsequently became a memorial to a great president. What was said by the Commission in its report regarding a cultural center is much truer of a memorial to President Kennedy.

Exhibit I

In my opinion the building at the height approved, will adversely affect both the Kennedy Center and the Lincoln Memorial. It will be considerably higher than either and in conjunction with the other Watergate buildings, it will dominate structures in this part of Washington.

The Commission of Fine Arts also said:

> "The members of the Commission were of the opinion that the buildings would be too tall according to present plans as all appeared to be nearer the 130-foot level than the 90-foot limit allowed by the present Zoning Regulations. This would result in an overpowering mass of buildings, where lower buildings should prevail. A greater variation of heights of the buildings was desirable in order to avoid the dullness of a uniform skyline."

The Watergate buildings already constructed and the approved building to be erected are of the same height. This height is much above the 130-foot level considered in the report as a maximum.

As I agree with the guidelines laid down by an earlier Commission, I have no choice but to dissent.

John Walker, Member
Commission of Fine Arts

20 September 1967

20 September 1967

Dear Governor Shepardson:

This is to confirm the actions of the Commission of Fine Arts, whose meeting you and your colleagues attended on September 20th.

The Commission approved the project which had the narrower fascia at the cornice line and a low setback which covers the mechanical equipment. Frankly I forget which project you called No. 1 and which you called No. 2 so I am not using these designations but I am sure it was clear to you and your colleagues which one we were approving.

Thank you for your patience through these proceedings. My fellow commissioners join me in enthusiasm for your new building.

With best wishes,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Charles N. Shepardson
Federal Reserve Building
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit J

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 September 1967

AM
9:30
I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. INTERVIEWS

1. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

9:30 a. Three Sisters Bridge - Revised Design

b. Inner Loop Freeway, South Leg - Revised Design

10:00 2. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

Police Training Facilities, Blue Plains, Va. - Proposed Design

10:15 3. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

Lincoln Park, Relandscaping, new walks, Bethune Memorial

10:30 4. D.C. Government, Board of Zoning Adjustment

Watergate Development - Height of Building 5 next to John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

11:00 5. Federal Reserve Board

Federal Reserve Board Building - Revised Design

11:15 6. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

O.G. 68-42, Georgetown University Heating and Cooling Plant

11:30 7. Freer Gallery of Art

Inspection of Proposed Acquisitions

1967-09-20
Jun 23, 2017